




3013049903

DS 79.65 H788 MAIN

  
THE LIBRARY  
OF  
THE UNIVERSITY  
OF TEXAS  
AT  
AUSTIN

**STATEMENT  
OF  
H.E. Mr. SADDAM HUSSEIN  
PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF IRAQ  
ON THE IRAQI - IRANIAN CONFLICT  
BEFORE  
THE THIRD SUMMIT MEETING OF THE  
ISLAMIC CONFERENCE**

**19 - 22 RABI'1 - AL AWAL , 1401  
25 - 28 JANUARY , 1981  
SAUDI ARABIA**

Add  
OH

**STATEMENT  
OF  
H.E. Mr. SADDAM HUSSEIN  
PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF IRAQ  
ON THE IRAQ - IRANIAN CONFLICT  
BEFORE  
THE THIRD SUMMIT MEETING OF THE  
ISLAMIC CONFERENCE**

**19 - 22 RABI'1 - AL AWAL , 1401**

**25 - 28 JANUARY , 1981**

**SAUDI ARABIA**



**In the name of God, the Merciful and the Compassionate**

**Brother President**

**Your Highness Prince Fahd**

**Brothers**

I should like at the outset to express on behalf of the Delegation of Iraq and on my own behalf our sincere thanks and gratitude to his Majesty King Khalid bin Abdul-Aziz, to His Highness prince Fahd for all the untiring efforts in organizing this August Conference and ensuring all means of its success. We pray to God Almighty now that the leaders of, the Islamic States are gathered in the holy city of Mecca in the land of divine revelation and the starting point of the great message of Islam to inspire us with determination, strength and reason for the purpose of achieving the great goals for which we are gathered here, and realizing positive results in the service of our holy religion and our believing people.

Iraq has embarked upon the initiative of requesting the convening of special meeting to discuss its conflict with Iran in order to present in detail all the dimensions and the historical background of the conflict. This is in order to explain to Their Majesties and Excellencies the Kings and Presidents of the Islamic States and their representatives the present war going on now in our region and which was imposed upon us by Iran.

Any problem cannot be divorced from its historical framework and direct causes. The efforts to solve the present outstanding conflict in a just and honourable manner require precise understanding to the nature of the conflict and in the light of its correct historical background.

The problem between Iraq and Iran goes back to more than 450 years of history. If we want to trace it chronologically. It is not a mere boundary problem,

nor is it a minor conflict over navigational rights. It is much wider than that, as the problem signifies itself in Iran's expansionist ambitions in the neighbouring and adjacent Arab areas.

Historically, and since, 1520, eighteen Treaties have been concluded between the Persian State and its western neighbours regarding its relations therewith including the question of borders. On all occasions, the Persian State chose the opportunity to violate the said Treaties whether by word or deed.

The Persian and the Ottoman States concluded the first Treaty in 1520 after Iran had occupied and annexed some areas of Iraq, which was then part of the Ottoman State. The Persian State was forced by that Treaty to withdraw from the territories it had occupied. That Treaty was followed by others, notably the Treaty of 1639 which was concluded at Zehab, and which included for the first time the basis for the delimitation of boundaries between the two States. The said Treaty was affirmed by the Treaty concluded at Kurdan in 1746, which provided that the boundaries between the two States were those provided for in the Treaty of 1639.

It is worth noting that in both of those Treaties, the Persian State was forced to withdraw from Arab lands within the Ottoman State against which, due to reasons of geography, the Persian State used to expand.

Subsequent to the war that took place between the Ottoman and the Persian States, the First Treaty of Erzerum was concluded in 1823. This Treaty affirmed the previous treaties concluded in relation to frontiers, especially that of 1746, and considered them binding and still in force. In this new Treaty, the two Parties emphasized specially the prevention of interference by the Persian State and in whatever manner in the affairs of Iraq which was at the time part of the Ottoman State. But

the boundary problems between the two states continued because of the continuation of Persian territorial encroachments and despite the Treaty already referred to. Due to the emergence of competition between Tzarist Russia and Britain to control the area, the Ottoman and the Persian States considered reaching final and firm borders for them. In this connection, Tzarist Russia and Britain performed the role of mediators, and the Second Treaty of Erzerum was concluded in 1847. In that Treaty, the Persian State obtained its first territorial expansion at the expense of Arab rights. The boundaries before 1847 were to the east of the Island of Abadan in the area of Shatt-al-Arab, as is shown on Map No. (1) of the Maps's Pamphlet distributed to you, and they became running along the eastern bank of Shatt-al-Arab as is also shown on Map No. 2.

In this connection, although Shatt-al-Arab remained with all its waters in the hands of the Ottoman State, and a part of Iraq which was then part of the Ottoman State, yet the Persian State secured a territorial gain over the lands on the eastern bank in the form of recognizing Persian sovereignty over the port and anchorage of Muhammara in front of al-Haffar-Canal in Karun River, and the Island of Khizr, now called (Abadan). The rest of the lands, towns, and ports on the said bank remained in the hands of the Ottoman State.

It is worth noting that the Treaty of 1847 explicitly provided that each Party renounced all its territorial claims in the lands of the other and undertook not to interfere in its internal affairs.

Accordingly, a joint commission was set up to mark the frontiers on the maps in accordance with the frontiers description provided for in the Treaty. That task was not achieved because of the wars which took place in the area, namely, the Crimean War between the Ottoman



State and Russia (1854 — 1856), the British-Persian War (1856—1857), and the Balkan War (1876 — 1878). So, the situation remained stagnant until 1911 when a difference arose regarding the implementation of the Treaty of Erzerum as a result of the refusal of the Persian State to abide by it.

Consequently, the Protocol of Tehran was concluded in 1911, which contained the agreement of the Ottoman and the Persian States to set up a joint commission to meet in Istanbul to decide upon and fix the frontier line between the two countries in a detached and neutral spirit. Afterwards, a technical commission was to apply the description of the boundaries on land according to the provisions of the Treaty of Erzerum of 1847.

After the Parties had met in Istanbul in 1912, they could not agree on the plan of work. As a result of the mediation of Russia and Britain again, the Istanbul Protocol of 1913 was concluded, which was signed by representatives of both parties and the mediating powers. The said Protocol provided for a clear description of the frontier line between the two countries, which was similar to that of the Treaty of Erzerum, 1847. The Protocol provided for demarcating the frontier line on land and constructing the necessary pillars by a commission the tasks of which were specifically determined. The Protocol also provided that any sector of the frontiers demarcated on land shall be considered as finally determined and shall not be subject to any amendment or revision thereafter.

In this Protocol, the Persian State once again secured a territorial gain at the expense of Arab rights. The Ottoman State ceded part of the Arab territory in Shatt-al-Arab in front of Muhammara Port and for a distance of four miles. Hence, the frontier line in this area became running in the mid channel for the said

distance and reverts back to follow the eastern bank of the river until it reaches the sea, leaving under Persian control a number of islands, as is shown on Map No. 3 of the Maps's Pamphlet, already distributed to you.

Consequently, a joint commission was set up according to the Protocol, and composed of representatives of Russia, Britain, the Ottoman State and Iran. The commission demarcated the frontier line on land in accordance with the description mentioned in the Protocol from the point of confluence of Shatt-al-Arab with the Arab Gulf in the south till Ararat in the north. The commission completed its work in October 1914, along with the records of its meetings, decisions, maps, and the construction of 126 frontiers pillars. These are the documents known as "The Proceedings of the Meetings of the Commission for the Delimitation of the Turco-Persian Frontiers, 1914". Thus, one should assume that the boundaries became final and recognised by the two Parties.

When Iraq became independent of the Ottoman Empire after the First World War, it succeeded the said Empire, in accordance with the rules of International Laws, to the Turkish Treaties relating to the Iraqi territory, the last of which were the 1913 Protocol and the Proceedings of the Frontiers Delimitation Commission of 1914. It was, therefore, to be expected that Iran should not raise any problem to Iraq in this respect. But, in fact, in the early days of Iraq's independence, and particularly in 1932, Iran committed a number of encroachments against Iraq's territory, and declared its non-adherence to the 1913 Protocol and the 1914 Proceedings. It started to commit a series of acts of armed intervention in Shatt-al-Arab and territorial encroachments by constructing border posts guarded by military forces inside Iraq. These encroachments were the subject matter of the complaint launched by Iraq in the League of Nations in



1934. The League recommended that the dispute be settled through direct negotiations.

The said conflict came to an end by the conclusion of the Border Treaty between Iraq and Iran in 4 July, 1937. Article (1) of that Treaty considered the 1913 Protocol and the Proceedings of the Meetings of the Frontiers Delimitation Commission of 1914 as valid and that the two Parties were bound to observe them, and provided, accordingly, that the boundary line between the two States was that defined and traced by the above-mentioned Commission of 1914.

As regards Shatt-al-Arab, Iran expanded again in accordance with this treaty at the expense of Iraq's territorial sovereignty, and obtained a new territorial gain in addition to what it had already gained in accordance with the 1913 treaty, namely Iraq ceding a small part of Shatt-al-Arab in front of Abadan to Iran wherein the frontier line runs along the Thalweq for a distance of about four miles.

With the exception of that, the boundary line between Iraq and Iran remained at the low water level at the eastern bank of Shatt-al-Arab according to the delimitation of the frontiers described in the Proceedings of the Meetings of the Frontiers Delimitation Commission of 1914. This is shown on Map No. (4) of the Maps's Pamphlet, also distributed to you.

Article 3 of the 1937 Treaty provided for appointing a commission for erecting the frontier pillars the location of which has been fixed and constructed by the 1914 Commission and of fixing additional pillars which it considers useful to erect. The purpose was, as was declared in the preamble of the Treaty, to settle definitely the frontier question between the two countries. The Frontier Pillars Commission was constituted in 1938 and

proceeded with its work until it was interrupted in 1940 because of Iran's withdrawal from it when it realised that it had committed a large territorial encroachment on Iraqi lands in the area of (Um Sheer) in the Governorate of Maisan in south eastern Iraq. Shortly afterwards, Iran reverted to raising the same boundary problems to Iraq which it used to raise before the conclusion of the 1937 Treaty. It started again to encroach upon Iraqi lands in numerous areas by constructing armed border posts and commit acts of armed intervention in Shatt-al-Arab, calling for entrusting the navigation therein to the competence of a joint commission with legislative, executive, and judicial powers despite the fact that it is a national river subject to full Iraqi sovereignty, as its name indicates.

Iran continued to raise these problems to Iraq during the era of both the monarchical and the republican regimes. It escalated its position, despite the fact that Iraq continued to seek through the diplomatic channel to settle the dispute and forge normal relations with Iran according to the legal obligations in force of both countries.

Despite all that, Iran followed anew the same path which it had used to pursue in the past. It declared unilaterally on 19 April, 1969, the termination of the Border Treaty of 1937.

Accordingly, Iran continued to deny its international obligations and violation of Iraqi sovereignty over land and in Shatt-al-Arab. It persisted in the flagrant interference in the internal affairs of Iraq through all means The situation became so critical to the extent of committing an armed aggression against Iraq in certain border areas, which prompted Iraq to launch a complaint against Iran in the Security Council in 1974.

Iraq sought all means to settle the dispute with Shahinshahi Iran in accordance with the rules of international law. But all Iraq's efforts were met at times with refusal and with procrastination at others.

Iran this time used to choose every given opportunity to call for the re-delimitation of the boundaries in Shatt-al-Arab on the basis of the Thalweg, i.e., the line of the deep navigable channel. The aim is clear naturally, namely to achieve a new territorial gain at the expense of Iraq by obtaining half of Shatt-al-Arab for a long distance in the river.

This situation continued from 1969 after the Revolution, until 1974 when the Algiers Agreement of that year came about.

Mr. President.

Brothers,

Before we deal in detail with the Algiers Agreement, we should like to explain to you its immediate background, for that would shed an enormous light on its paragraphs and fundamental objectives.

Since the Revolution of 17 July, 1968, Iraq was and still is one of the firm adherents to the policy of non-alignment, which is based on the principles of non-interference in internal affairs, respect of national sovereignty of all States, and ensuring peace and security in the world.

In addition, our foreign policy does not tolerate any interference in the independence of Iraq and the Arab countries, our sovereignty, territorial integrity in any form, from any side or on any pretext whatsoever. We have adhered to this policy and these principles in our foreign policy proceeding from a profound need and a long national and Pan-Arab experience in this regards. For, as you are no doubt aware that any disequilibrium in the basis

of balance in State relations would certainly lead to impairing the rights and sovereignty of one side in favour of another.

In order to avoid this phenomenon, which has often led to tension and crisis, it is imperative to found international cooperation on rules that aim at the achievement of joint interests within the framework of non-interference in internal affairs. That is particularly true in the case of neighbouring States, because the geographical reality imposes upon them a policy of good neighbourliness, and non-intervention in internal affairs.

In its relations with Iran, Iraq has adhered firmly to that policy, an approach which is based on a number of realities that arise from the geographical neighbourliness and the historical ties between the people of Iraq and the Iranian peoples.

Our relations with Iran have witnessed grave crises because of the policies of successive regimes in Iran which have considered Iraq and the Arab homeland, particularly the Arab Gulf area, as a sphere for domination and influence.

The said policies have been expressed in different forms appropriate to the particular exigencies of the time. During the rule of the Shah, arrogance, aggression, territorial expansion at the expense of the Arabs and attempts to harm Iraq's national sovereignty and the rights of the Arab nation were a constant pattern. Iraq and the Arab nation were regarded as a sphere of influence for the expansionist plans of Iranian interests. That policy has been followed throughout history by the State of Persia against its neighbours to the west, and as we have shown.

When the Revolution of 17 July, 1968, took place in Iraq, and at the time when Iraq was occupied with building a new society on the basis of justice and welfare,



2  
0  
struggling to liberate its national wealth from the exploitation of colonial monopolies, adding its efforts to those of its Arab brothers in the struggle against the Zionist aggression, in that particular time, the regime of the Shah in Iran was acquiring arms at a very exceptional level. That regime was preparing itself to exercise the role of the policeman in the region with the full support of, and in coordination with, the United States of America and the colonial forces in the world. That suspect policy drove the Shah to provoke independent Iraq constantly seeking to weaken and harass the national regime brought about by the Revolution. The beginning was a propaganda campaign and numerous attempts at plotting, creating political crises, supporting the rebellious and mutinous movement in northern Iraq openly, and unabatingly, continuing with the territorial encroachments, ignoring international agreements, and committing armed aggression, in actual fact.

Then in order to achieve his ambitions, the Shah began to exert military pressure directly or indirectly, believing that the military means would ensure the achievement of his expansionist aims and ambitions.

The Shah began to support the reactionary secessionist rebellion in northern Iraq on a large scale and hence started to exercise a direct role in the field in order to dismember Iraq.

The Shah's support for the secessionist rebellion was limitless. He provided the reactionary leadership of the rebellion with huge quantities of modern and sophisticated armaments and put at its disposal all his material, military, political and media facilities, including the services of his advanced intelligence apparatus. He presented it with direct military support by sending contingents of his army to the areas of fighting, and amassed his troops along all the borders with Iraq. All that took place under

the care and with the encouragement of the United States, and the participation of the Zionist entity through its representatives whose Prime Minister declared on 29 September 1980, that the Zionist entity had provided Barazani with weapons, equipment, instructors, and provided the rebels with training from 1965 to 1975.

Iraq fought a bitter conflict against that agent clique and the aggressive policies of the Shah, in order to defend its sovereignty and national unity. Iraq suffered sixty thousands casualties between martyrs and wounded of armed forces personnel and civil population, aside from the enormous material losses. The military situation reached a dangerous point when the Shah advanced his military troops on numerous occasions to fight directly against our forces in various fronts with a view to supporting the military position of the agent rebellion.

These were the conditions which dictated upon us, and indeed forced us, to work towards a political solution. Hence, when the late President of Algeria, Houari Boumedienne, may God rest his soul in peace, took the initiative of communicating with us and Iran, we agreed to that initiative, and the Algiers Agreement was concluded on 6 March 1975, under these circumstances.

The spirit of the Algiers Agreement appears in its Preamble, which provided that the Parties had reached the Agreement in order to arrive at a final and permanent solution to all existing problems between the two countries in application of the principles of territorial integrity, inviolability of frontiers and non-interference in internal affairs. The four Paragraphs of the Agreement provided the following:

1. Carrying out a definitive demarcation of terrestrial frontiers on the basis of the Istanbul Protocol of 1913 and the proceedings of the meetings of the Delimita-



tion Commission of the Turco-Persian Frontiers of 1914.

2. The delimitation of the fluvial frontiers in Shatt-al-Arab according to the Thalweg line. We have already explained that the Thalweg line runs in the middle of the deep, navigable waters.
3. The undertaking of the two Parties to restore security and confidence along the common frontiers and the obligation to exercise a strict and effective control over the said frontiers for the purpose of cessation of all acts of infiltrations of a subversive character.
4. The Agreement to consider all the above-mentioned arrangements as indivisible elements of a comprehensive solution, and that hence any violation of which shall naturally be considered as against the spirit of the Algiers Agreement. That is to say that any violation of any of the three interconnected paragraphs will be considered a violation of the paragraphs as a whole. This is the Algiers Agreement and these are its circumstances.

In order to put these arrangements in the form of documents containing the technical details, a joint ministerial Iraq-Iranian Commission was established with the participation of Algeria. The Treaty on State Frontiers and Good Neighbourliness, its three Protocols and annexes were signed at Baghdad on 13 June, 1973.

It is evident from what we have said that the Algiers Agreement represented a package deal in which the political and the juridical aspects were balanced in a manner which made the violation of any of its constituent elements a violation of that balance and a reason for the collapse of the Agreement. By the same token, it follows logically that in the implementation of the settlement referred to, the two Parties should be able to achieve the

balanced gains which they have agreed upon at the time and in accordance with the circumstances to which we have already referred. But what happened in fact was that Iran scored an instant and direct gain as soon as the Algiers agreement entered into force, for its position in Shatt-al-Arab became that of a partner in sovereignty over a large part of it. This was because of the redelimitation of the frontiers in Shatt-al-Arab on the basis of the Thalweg. As for the Iraqi lands upon which Iran had encroached, they were not delivered to Iraq before the fall of the regime of the Shah. We were in the process of receiving them when the Revolution in Iran began; their delivery was in fact delayed and when the new rulers took over they did not return these lands to us. Iran thus continued to occupy Iraqi lands dear to us. Also, they have not been delivered after the fall of the Shah's regime as is shown in Maps Nos. 6 and 7 of the Maps's Pamphlet, already distributed to you.

Mr. President,

The new regime in Iran came to power after the fall of the Shah's regime, and the situation regarding the implementation of the Algiers Agreement was as I explained. Iran has achieved a new territorial gain which it benefited from at the expense of Iraq, but Iraq has not obtained what was due to it according to all the international agreements concluded before 1975, and the 1975 Agreement itself.

Despite that, we expected or hoped that the new rulers would open a new page in their relations with Iraq and the Arab nation. On this basis, Iraq on its part, took numerous positive initiatives towards achieving that goal.

We addressed an official Note to the Iranian government on 13 February 1979, in which we explained Iraq's established policy of forging the closest fraternal ties



and relations of cooperation with the peoples neighbouring Iraq, and particularly with Iran, on the basis of respect to sovereignty, and non-interference in internal affairs. We also expressed our sympathy and support for the struggle being waged by the Iranian peoples for freedom, justice and progress, pointing out Iraq's appreciation to the victory achieved by the Iranian peoples.

The President of the Republic of Iraq also addressed on 5 April, 1979, a telegram to Khomeini on the occasion of the declaration of the Islamic Republic, in which he expressed his congratulations on that occasion, and Iraq's desire that the new republican regime would open wider opportunities to serve the friendly Iranian peoples in a manner that promotes Iran's role in the service of peace and justice in the world, and forges the strongest relations of friendship and neighbourliness with the Arab countries in general and Iraq in particular, Khomeini however, replied to that telegram in a manner contrary to the courtesy due to Heads of State, and particularly that between Muslim leaders.

Despite that we sent an invitation to Mr. Mehdi Bazargan, the head of the interim Iranian government to visit Iraq and conduct negotiations regarding bilateral relations and the bases of joint cooperation. On 2 August, 1979, the Vice-Chairman of the Revolutionary Command Council renewed the invitation in a letter to Mr. Bazargan on the occasion of the month of Ramadhan.

In the Ministerial Meeting of the Coordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries which was held in Colombo in 1979, Iraq was behind the inclusion of a paragraph in the final declaration welcoming Iran's withdrawal from CENTO. Iraq also welcomed Iran's application to join the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and adopting a recommendation to that effect at the Summit Conference in Havana.

In my statement to the Sixth Summit Conference of Non-Aligned States held in Havana, I welcomed Iran's joining the membership of the Movement. I personally emphasized in two meetings with the former Foreign Minister of Iran Mr. Ibrahim Yazdi, in Havana during the Non-Aligned Summit Conference of 1979, Iraq's desire to establish relations of cooperation and good neighbourliness with Iran. We have expressed our readiness to meet with Iranian leaders in order to deal with the problems of bilateral relations by peaceful means. Our Foreign Minister also emphasized this approach in his meeting with the Foreign Minister of Iran in September 1979 at the United Nations Headquarters in New York. When the President of the Republic of Iran, Mr. Bani Sadr, assumed his office, our Ambassador in Tehran visited him upon my personal instructions, on 20 February 1980 to convey to him personal congratulations on that occasion.

We have taken all these steps in order to putting our relations with Iran on correct and positive bases. Our starting point was the policy of good neighbourliness, and the desire to establish normal relations with Iran. But in their well-known arrogance, the new rulers of Iran turned away from all these initiatives. They were determined with full intention to abuse Iraq, and expand at its expense, and go along the same hostile and expansionist path taken by the Shah of Iran. This appeared from the statements made by them, and their deeds and practices, regarding which we have distributed to the distinguished delegations dossiers containing ample and documented information.

The basic motive behind the hostile position adopted by the new regime in Iran is the desire to expand at the expense of Iraq and the Arab countries in the Arab Gulf region and to interfere in its internal affairs. This has



taken now a new cover, which is what the Iranian responsible officials term as the exportation of revolution to the neighbouring countries.

You all know that this is the policy of the new rulers of Iran which tries to export what is known as their new revolution and its principles to all Islamic countries. There is no one amongst you who does not know that they are interfering in the internal affairs of all Islamic countries.

Iran's new rulers behaved on this basis, and declared that explicitly on various occasions.

**Mr. President,**

**Brothers,**

The attitude and intentions of the Iranian regime in the so-called exportation of revolution did not stop at making statements, but passed that limit in the endeavours to transfer it to actual reality against Iraq and other Islamic countries. This took place under the direct supervision of the regime's leaders. In Qom and Tehran, specialized institutions and quarters were established to plot against Iraq and the neighbouring states. The plotting against Iraq was escalated through the commission of acts of terrorism and sabotage by Iranians, which the Iranian authorities helped to infiltrate inside Iraq, and assisted by Iranian residents in Iraq and individuals of Iranian descent. In fact, these groups committed during the first half of 1980 ugly terrorist acts, from which not even the Muslim praying masses in the mosques escaped. All these terrorist acts were directed from Qom, as has been established by the instructions issued and broadcast daily to the agents of the Iranian regime from the official Iranian broadcasting stations, which included even instructions as to manufacturing local bombs. This is in addition to the official statements emanating from the res-

ponsible Iranian officials which instigated murder, terrorism, and sabotage. The most cruel act of terrorism was the hurling of bombs at a huge students gathering held at al-Mustansiriyah University in Baghdad on 1 April, 1980, which resulted in killing and wounding a large number of students. Similarly, the hurling of bombs on 5 April, 1980, from the Iranian school in Waziriyah at the funeral procession of the martyrs who were killed at al-Mustansiriyah incident. In this second operation, some Iranian officials of the Iranian School's teachers participated.

In all these incidents, Iranian agents were caught, and the security forces seized large quantities of arms, ammunition and money which were put by the ruling authorities in Tehran at the disposal of those agents. It is worth noting that the objectives and organisation of this agent organ, connected with Qom, were uncovered for us by one of its leaders whose confessions were broadcasted by Iraqi Radio and Television at the time.

The Embassy of the Republic of Iraq in Tehran was the largest target of numerous acts of aggression, provocation, and threats of burning and occupation. Hundreds of demonstrations were organised against Iraq with the full knowledge of the Iranian authorities. The Iraqi Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Iraqi Embassy in Tehran sent numerous Notes of protest to the Iranian government regarding these acts. The Iraqi Ambassador in Tehran called on the Vice Prime Minister for Information, the Prime Minister, and the responsible officials of the Iranian Foreign Ministry in connection therewith. All this in addition to calling in the Iranian Ambassador in Baghdad by the Iraqi Foreign Ministry on numerous occasions to deliver protests to him against those attacks and request taking the necessary measures to stop them, copies of these notes have been distributed to you.



The Consulate of the Republic of Iraq at Muhammara was subjected to the ugliest kind of aggression. It was attacked on 11 and 26 October, and 1 and 7 November, 1979. Its doors and windows were destroyed, its officials and guards beaten, and its records abused. All those acts were committed in order to have the Consulate closed, and it was actually closed by the Iranian side.

The Iraqi Ministry of Foreign Affairs protested against that act on 5 December, 1979, and the Iranian authorities deported the staff of the Consulate on January, 11, 1980, after it had treated them very harshly, this was done before the date agreed upon by both countries for the closure of the Consulate.

It is worth noting also that the Iranian authorities have abused the privileges of the Iraqi schools in Tehran, closed them all, and deported their staff. None escaped the Iranian attacks, not even the Iraqi Airways office in Tehran.

All these acts undoubtedly constitute a flagrant violation of good neighbourly relations and the principle of non-interference in internal affairs and the prevention of infiltration of a subversive character regulated by the Algiers Agreement.

The rulers of Iran have not stopped at that, as they started, parallel with their sabotaging activities, to renew the life of the agent rebellious movement in Northern Iraq. The Iranian government recalled the leaders of that movement, already defeated in 1975, from the United States of America to Iran and gave them a new support, as the Shah did formerly, in all means in order to threaten Iraq's security and national unity. The Iranian government has also put a special broadcasting station at the disposal of that clique which cooperated with the Zionist entity between 1965 and 1975, as has been recognised by Begin in his above-mentioned speech.

I have referred a while ago to the question of the Iraqi lands which Iran did not deliver to Iraq despite its long encroachment thereon, as provided by the Algiers Agreement, and how the fall of the Shah regime led to the more completion of delivery. The new regime came to power and we granted it the opportunity to implement Iran's obligations. But what happened with the advent of the era of the new regime is that with the beginning of tension, the Iranian military presence in those Iraqi lands increased instead of delivering them back to Iraq. Those very areas, being areas of Iraq, became themselves the source of armed attacks on the Iraqi border region. The attacks were coupled with persistent violations of Iraqi air space by the Iranian Air Force. For example, we should like to mention to you that the number of violations of Iraqi air space by the Iranian Air Force reached 249 for the period February 1979 to September 1980. This is recorded in the official notes sent by Iraq to Iran through the Iraqi Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The number of incidents of firing across the frontiers and on the border posts and attacks thereon, artillery shelling, obstructing navigation in Shatt-al-Arab, and shelling at civilian targets reached 244 for the period of June 1979 to September 1980. This is also recorded in official notes. Civilian aircraft were fired at three times and one airplane was forced by Iranian Air Force inside Iraqi air space, to land inside Iran during the period of August 1980 to September 1980. The bombardment of economic installations including petroleum installations took place seven times during the period of January 1980 to September 1980. All these violations which flagrantly contravene the Algiers Agreement, and any principle of normal relations with Iran, have been documented in official Notes forwarded to the Iranian government, hoping that it would abide by law and reason. The number of the official Notes forwarded to the Iranian government reached 293 Notes which you will find amongst the documents distributed.



On September 4, 1980 a dangerous turning point in the chain of those violations occurred. The Iranian military forces used American-made heavy artillery of 175mm calibre to bombard peaceful Iraqi towns. Thus the towns of Qhanaqin, Mendeli, Zurbatia and the oil region known as Naftkhana, where the savage bombardment started, were all exposed to heavy shelling which resulted in severe loss of life and damage to property. It is worth mentioning that that concentrated savage bombardment was carried out from the area of Zain al-Qaws, Saif Sa'ad and Maimak which are part of Iraqi lands usurped by Iran, and which are recognised as such and documented in all international treaties concluded between Iraq and Iran including the 1975 Agreement.

At noon on 7 September 1980, savage bombardment was again laid down in the same manner. In our turn we called the Charge d'Affaires of the Iranian Embassy in Baghdad to the Foreign Ministry on that date and delivered a Note to him. In it we stated that Iranian military units had encroached upon numerous areas of Iraqi territory as was the case, inter alia, Zain Al-Qaws, and that the said encroachments had continued. We requested him to convey to his government that it should immediately end those encroachments by withdrawing the Iranian military forces from areas encroached upon. But the Iranian forces continued their bombardments until night fall of that day.

On the following day, 8 September 1980, the Iranian Charge d'Affaires was again called in to the Foreign Ministry and we handed him another Note. In that Note we stated that the Iraqi military forces in the exercise of our legitimate right to self-defence, were forced to end the Iranian occupation of Zain Al-Qaws and regain the occupied Iraqi territories.

In the Note we expressed the hope that the Iranians would learn from that event and give back the Iraqi lands

which Iran had encroached upon in previous times, as was agreed upon in the 1975 Treaty, hence avoiding the possibility of wider confrontation between the two countries. But the following days witnessed again concentrated military activities by the Iranian military forces inside the Iraqi territories that had been encroached upon. Our government found it necessary once again to call in the Iranian Charge d'Affaires to the Foreign Ministry on 11 September 1980. He was handed a detailed Note this time stating the following points:

First, from our observation of Iranian conduct and reactions, we have reached various conclusions the first of which is that, because of the confusion in Iran and the disordered structure and information sources of the Iranian State, the Iranian leadership might not be aware of the fact that Iran had encroached upon Iraqi territories in contravention of International Law and past agreements between the two countries, including the Algiers Agreement of 1975. If this is so, we advise the Iranian leadership to ask the Iranian authorities responsible for matters of frontiers and agreements in order to ascertain our point of view and henceforth to base its action on knowledge rather than illusion.

Secondly, The Iranian leadership should realize that striking at cities populated by civilians, as it did in bombarding Khanaqin and Mendili, is neither a simple matter nor a game of violence of the sort with which the Iranian officials entertain themselves at times inside Iran. Striking at Iraqi cities is considered a grave matter which should be avoided by Iran, if it does not wish relations between the two countries to deteriorate dangerously. The rulers of Iran alone will bear the responsibility of those aggressive actions before God, the Iranian peoples and world public opinion.



Thirdly, Iraq has no ambitions with regard to Iranian territories.

End of Note you will observe from it that in spite of continued aggression culminating in shelling towns and the use of Iranian Air Force against our Armed Forces the Note was nevertheless, prudent and reasonable to try to guide Iran into knowing the historical and legal background of the problem and to avoid any misjudgement.

All these diplomatic Notes fell on deaf ears, as we did not receive any reply to them from the rulers of Iran, except one full of vituperation and threats, delivered, before September 22.

Iran has persisted in its hostile attitude, and has not shown any respect to the 1975 Agreement. On the contrary, the Iranian responsible officials stated publicly more than once that they do not recognise that Agreement, describing it as against the interests of Iran. They even described it as dead, saying and some of you present at this session know that - that it was suspicious, and concluded under the auspices of the U.S.A., by Saddam Hussein and the Shah. These declarations were made before and after the rulers of Iran assumed power. In particular, they did not reply to the Iraqi official and written Note of 27 June, 1980, in which we specifically asked them whether they considered that Agreement as still valid between the two countries.

In view of all this clear evidence, it was established by the government of the Republic of Iraq that the Iranian Government had violated the elements of the comprehensive settlement contained in the 1975 agreement and that it had terminated it unilaterally. Consequently, the Iraqi Government decided on 17 September, to consider the said Agreement and those following it and based upon it as terminated on the part of Iraq after Iran had terminated them by word and deed. This was done in

accordance with Paragraph (4) of that Agreement and Article (4) of the Treaty on State Frontiers and Good Neighbourliness which was based upon it.

On that occasion, Iraq called upon the Iranian authorities to accept the new situation and act rationally and wisely in view of the exercise by Iraq of its legitimate rights and full sovereignty over all its terrestrial territories and fluvial territory in Shatt-al-Arab.

I personally declared on that occasion that we do not desire any war with Iran, and do not aim at widening the area of conflict with it outside the restoration of Iraq's legitimate rights in territorial sovereignty, and that Iraq has no territorial ambitions in Iran. Yet, the Iranian government escalated the conflict. It began as from 19 September to shell with heavy artillery and bombard with planes densely populated areas and vital economic installations in Iraq, Iraqi and foreign incoming and outgoing commercial vessels in Shatt-al-Arab and the navigational channels in the river as well as its approaches in the Arab Gulf, aiming meanwhile at Iraqi military forces. In addition, the Iranian authorities declared the closure of its air space to civil aviation, and the closure of the Strait of Hormuz to Iraqi navigation, contrary to international law. It also declared public mobilization and amassed with great concentration its military forces along the whole border, and started with wide military operations. The Iranian military forces issued four military communiques, broadcast over Radio Tehran, relating to its activities during the period 18 September, 1980. In its third communique issued on 19 September, 1980 Iran stated that it has used the air force in its military operations. In the third communique issued on 19 September, 1980 the Iranian authorities boasted that it had set on fire Naftkhana field in Iraq. All this happened before 22 September, 1980, which is considered by some to be the beginning of the war between Iraq and Iran, while the war began on 4th September,



1980, as explained by all these accidents and confirmed by military communiques, broadcast with impunity and boasts.

In the face of these acts, we issued a statement on 22 September, 1980 warning the ruling authorities in Iran of the consequences of that escalation and the indiscriminate strikes which they have committed, putting the full responsibility in connection therewith upon the said authorities. The Iraqi government also explained in that statement that the acts committed by Iran made it necessary to direct preventive strikes against Iranian military targets inside Iran with a view to protecting the safety, security, and vital interests of Iraq. Thus, once again Iraq was forced to exercise its right to preventive self-defence in accordance with international law in order to repel aggression.

When the war was meant to start on Iraqi territory, then let it start on Iranian territory; and when we declare that we will not withdraw our forces from Iranian territory except after they admit an end to the state of war, and recognize our rights as fixed in treaties concluded between us and them; This is because we want to ensure the security of Iraq, and will not withdraw without guarantees of these principles; otherwise Iran will push forth and the war will take place on Iraqi territory, destroying Iraqi economic installations and Iraqi towns. This we shall not allow.

#### Brothers,

It is clear from what I have said that it was Iran which started the war against Iraq on 4 September, 1980, and expanded it during the following days. Iraq has not encroached upon Iran's borders or rights, when it was forced to liberate Iraqi lands in Zain Al-Qaws, Saif Sa'ad and Maimak and other Iraqi territories from the illegal Iranian occupation during the period 8 September to

11 September, 1980 Despite the Iranian escalation and widening of the military operations, Iraq was patient throughout the whole period of 11 September to 22 September 1980, without crossing the frontiers line into Iran. Iraq's patience came to an end when Iran widened its aggression to the extent of closing Shatt-al-Arab, our sole national fluvial outlet to the sea, striking at our vital economic interests and peaceful cities including oil installations and the closing of the Hormuz Straits, and gaining ample evidence as to the wider aggressive intention of Iran, when the totality of Iraq became exposed to a wide military action from Iran. We were forced again on that date to defend ourselves by pushing the Iranian military forces deep inside the Iranian land mass in order that our towns, population, and interests remain secure from aggression.

All these acts and practices committed by the rulers of Iran left nothing of the provisions of the Algiers Agreement. The Agreement was demolished by Iran in word and deed. And it is surprising that the Iranians raised after a month from the beginning of war on 4 September, 1980, the question of applying the provisions of the 1975 Treaty relating to the settlement of disputes contained in Article (6) of the said Treaty. That Article related to the settlement of differences between the two Parties regarding the interpretation and application of the Treaty, and this presupposes the existence of the Treaty through the adherence of both parties to it. It is untenable logically and legally to have Iran allowing for itself the termination of the Treaty by word, deed, and aggression, and then come to apply a provision which presupposes, at the time of its application, the adherence of Iran to the Treaty that contains it. Any argument to the contrary would be dangerous from the view point of substance, namely that there is a contradiction between the provisions regarding this question and those contained in Article (4) of the Treaty, which incarnated the provisions of Paragraph (4)



of the Algiers Agreement which I explained to you earlier. The meaning of this would be to divorce the Algiers Agreement and the Treaty from being a comprehensive settlement composed of indivisible politico-juridical elements.

### Brothers,

This is how the war started between us and Iran. Despite all these bitter facts, Iraq cooperated with all the international efforts to settle the conflict and end the fighting. We have offered Iran peace on 28 September, 1980, and declared that what we seek is to regain our legitimate national rights in our lands and waters. We have also declared our full readiness to withdraw from the Iranian territories and establishing normal relations with Iran on the basis of respect to sovereignty and non-interference in internal affairs. We have accepted the Security Council Resolution (479) of 28 September, 1980 and declared on our part unilaterally a cease-fire from 5 to 8 October, 1980, in response to the request of H.E. President Muhammed Zia al-Haq of Pakistan, who was undertaking a good-offices mission in his capacity as the Chairman of the Islamic Conference at the time. His Excellency did not touch upon this in his address. Do you realize, gentlemen, how dangerous it is for one side to take the initiative of ceasing fire unilaterally while the two armies are locked in battle? The Iraqi Army was locked in battle with the Iranian Army but when President Zia-ul-Haq asked Iraq to take the initiative as a brotherly, face-saving gesture towards Iran, we responded because we do not want to humiliate the Iranian people or army, but we do not allow any one to humiliate our people and army, or to violate our sovereignty and security. Thus we accepted a cease-fire in spite of objections by a number of brothers in the leadership to this serious matter at first. We declared our acceptance of this step three days earlier, although Iran rejected

it. We adhered to the date and time decided upon to cease fire; but Iran tried to exploit it to launch a counter attack. It is then natural that such a cease-fire is impractical and incorrect. But Iran did not meet these sincere intentions except by its persistence in aggression, arrogance, and hostile statements. Moreover, some have misinterpreted this gesture of good will on the part of Iraq, its readiness to establish peace and cease-fire as a weak point, in the hope that. Iran, through a military solution, may impose anew **fait accompli** upon Iraq, contrary to its sovereignty, security and the interests of its people.

We have emphasized to all those who have sought to stop the war and the achievement of a peaceful settlement that we have fought in response to the Iranian aggression and for legitimate rights, and that we aim at restoring those rights and achieving a just and honourable settlement to the conflict and pushing away the evil from our sovereignty and people. We have also emphasized the necessity for the prevalence of the principle of non-acquisition by force in the relations between Iraq and the Arab nation on the one hand, and Iran on the other. The lands and rights which Iran has usurped by force should be restored to its lawful owners. This is one of your constant principles as well as being a principle of international law; a divine as well as a mundane law Iraq is fully ready to restore the Iranian lands occupied in the war. By all this a just and honourable settlement would be achieved. Hence, the appropriate climate for the establishment of normal relations between Iran, the arabs and Iraq, away from the expansionist inclinations and the acts of aggression would be achieved, as well as the appropriate conditions for all the countries in the area for evolution, development, stability, and real independence.

We emphasized these bases from a position of strength, and not a position of weakness, it is a position of stren-



gth based upon just principles, and not upon aggression,, and state once again our full desire and readiness to cooperate with all the international organisations, including the Organisation of the Islamic Conference, to reach that honourable goal. Iraq did not start this war, neither did it desire its continuation. The rulers of Iran bear the full responsibility for triggering the war, and its continuation, with all the disaster that it would bring about on Iran and the Islamic peoples.

**Mr. President,**

**Brothers,**

Islam does not ordain disunity and strife. It does not allow breach of pledges and violation of agreements, for although the Algiers Agreement was imposed on us, in the conditions I have already described, yet had the new rulers of Iran adhered to it, we would have done the same, not because we believe the Algiers Agreement to be correct, but because we signed it for we do honour agreements while the gentlemen, the new rulers of Iran violated the 1975 Agreement and therefore there can be no return to it. Moreover Islam does not accept the denial of the rights of others. It does not approve of fanning conflicts, enmities, the use of force and violence against Muslims without a legitimate reason.

It is not part of Islam to divide the unity of the Muslims and separate them from each other.

The noble religion of Islam orders us to do good deeds and not abuse, to give everyone his due rights, and that none of us should violate the other. Islam orders us to protect our neighbours, respect his rights and assist him, and not to usurp his lands, and spill the blood of his sons illegally.

The great Prophet, Muhammad, Peace be Unto Him, is the last prophet and the Seal of Messengers, the book of God is clear, and the Sunna of His Prophet and His Companions is as clear as the sun. There is no new prophesy, or trusteeship over Muslims, and there is nothing between the Muslim and his God except the Book of God and the Sunna of His Prophet.

The opportunity for peace still exists, and the possibility for the unity of the Muslims is still real if we adhere to right, away from grudges, and return to reason, away from fanaticism and greed.

**Brothers,**

After all this, I am but part of you and of this honourable Conference. Whatever the Conference decides upon, we shall be party thereunto. And as we have already clearly declared, over and over again, we are willing to achieve peace, not out of weakness or fear but out of a sincere desire reflecting good will and humanity, and expressing divine principles leading in that direction .

May Allah help us all to follow His Commands and lead us to wisdom and the correct path.

**Peace be upon you all.**